

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ALEKSANDAR KAVCIC,
Plaintiff,
v.
BROADCOM INC.,
Defendant.

Case No. 20-cv-01246-MMC

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND
DENYING IN PART DEFENDANT'S
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO FILE
ANSWER UNDER SEAL;
DIRECTIONS TO DEFENDANT**

Re: Dkt. No. 33

Before the Court is defendant's Administrative Motion to File Under Seal, filed May 22, 2020, whereby defendant seeks to file under seal the unredacted version of its "Answer, Affirmative Defenses, and Counterclaims to Plaintiff's Complaint" ("Answer").¹ Plaintiff's counsel has filed a declaration stating plaintiff has no objection thereto.

Having read and considered the above written submissions, the Court rules as follows:

1. With respect to the matter set forth in the Answer on (a) page 8, lines 18-20, (b) page 8, lines 22-24, (c) page 15, lines 26-27, and (d) page 16, line 2, the motion is hereby DENIED, as defendant has failed to show such portions of the Answer are properly filed under seal, the same content having been included in the version of the Answer filed by defendant in the public record.


2. In all other respects, the motion is hereby GRANTED.

¹Defendant filed in the public record a redacted version of its Answer.

3. Defendant is hereby DIRECTED to file in the public record, no later than seven days from the date of this order, a revised redacted version of its Answer.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 28, 2020


MAXINE M. CHESNEY
United States District Judge

United States District Court
Northern District of California